

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated June 19, 2006, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1 and 36 have been amended and claims 8-9, 11, 19, and 28-31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 and 36 have been amended to clarify that the portable wireless communication device includes a display and that the cover is transparent and pivotally attached to the housing by at least two hinges such that the cover is pivotable from a first position wherein it covers the keypad to another position wherein the keypad is exposed and the cover is folded around a back portion of the portable wireless communication device and further acts as a stand for propping up the portable wireless communication device at an angle on a surface, and wherein the housing includes a scrolling means proximate to the keypad, wherein the scrolling means is not covered when the cover is in the first position thereby enabling a user to use the scrolling means to perform a scrolling operation viewable on the display through the cover when the cover is in the first position. Support for these amendments may be found in cancelled claim 8, Figures 12-13, and on page 12, line 16 through page 13, line 17. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12, 13, 15-18, 28-30, 26, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ying et al. (US 6,307,511, hereinafter “Ying”) and Phillips et al. (US 5,014,346, hereinafter “Phillips”). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ying, Phillips, and Wolff (US 5,933,772). Claims 8, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ying, Philips, and Sirola et al. (US 2001/0012769, hereinafter “Sirola”). Claims 14, 19, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ying, Phillips, and Shima, et al. (US 5,489,924, hereinafter “Shima”).

Claim Objections

Claims 30-31 are objected to because of various informalities. As noted above, claims 30-31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer thereby rendering moot the aforementioned objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12, 13, 15-18, 28-30, 36, and 37

Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12, 13, 15-18, 28-30, 36, and 37 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ying in view of Phillips. Claim 30 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering moot the rejection of this claim. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 specifies a protector for a portable wireless communication device that has a housing, a display, and a keypad and contains at least one signal processing circuit. The protector includes a transparent cover pivotally attached to the housing by at least two hinges such that said cover is pivotable from a first position wherein it covers the keypad to another position wherein the keypad is exposed and the cover is folded around a back portion of the portable wireless communication device and further acts as a stand for propping up the portable wireless communication device at an angle on a surface, and wherein the housing includes a scrolling means proximate to the keypad, wherein the scrolling means is not covered when the cover is in the first position thereby enabling a user to use the scrolling means to perform a scrolling operation viewable on the display through the cover when the cover is in the first position; and a planar antenna attached to the exterior of both the cover and the housing where the planar antenna is capacitively coupled to the signal processing circuit such that the planar

antenna is electromagnetically coupled to the signal processing circuit without being physically coupled to the signal processing circuit.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ying and Phillips fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose a transparent cover pivotally attached to a housing by at least two hinges such that the cover is pivotable from a first position wherein it covers the keypad to another position wherein the keypad is exposed and the cover is folded around a back portion of the portable wireless communication device and further acts as a stand for propping up the portable wireless communication device at an angle on a surface, and wherein the housing includes a scrolling means proximate to the keypad, wherein the scrolling means is not covered when the cover is in the first position thereby enabling a user to use the scrolling means to perform a scrolling operation viewable on the display through the cover when the cover is in the first position.

Ying discusses a portable electronic communication device having a single hinge and a “flip” cover which covers a keyboard when closed and which uncovers the keyboard when opened (see Figure 2). Thus Ying fails to disclose a transparent cover pivotally attached to a housing by at least two hinges. Ying also fails to disclose that the cover is pivotable from a first position wherein it covers the keypad to another position wherein the cover is folded around a back portion of the communication device and acts as a stand for propping up the communication device at an angle on a surface (see Figure 2). Ying also fails to disclose a scrolling means proximate to the keypad which is not covered when the cover is in the first position enabling a user to use the scrolling means to perform a scrolling operation viewable on the display when the cover is in the first position (see Figure 2).

Phillips fails to cure the deficiencies in Ying as this reference merely discusses a portable radio having a hinged “flip” for covering a keyboard (see Figure 1). Phillips, like Ying, also fails to disclose a transparent cover pivotally attached to a housing by at least two hinges, which is pivotable from a first position wherein it covers the keypad to another position wherein the cover is folded around a back portion of the communication device and acts as a stand for propping up the communication device at an angle on a surface, and a scrolling means proximate to the keypad which is not covered when the cover is in the first position enabling a user to use the scrolling means to perform a scrolling operation viewable on the display when the cover is in the first position.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Ying and Phillips fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 3-7, 10, 12, 13, and 15-18 depend from amended independent claim 1, specify at least the same features, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Independent claim 36 recites similar features as amended independent claim 1 and is thus also allowable for at least the same reasons. Claim 37 depends from amended independent claim 36 and is thus also allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3-7, 10, 12, 13, 15-18, and 36-37 should also be withdrawn.

Claim 2

Claim 2 is rejected as being unpatentable over Ying in view of Phillips and Wolff. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 depends from amended independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Ying and Phillips fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 1.

Wolff is concerned with a closed coin holder for attachment to a pager. The cover may have a single hinge for retaining a coin (see Figure 6). Wolff, however, fails to disclose a cover pivotally attached to a housing by at least two hinges, which is pivotable from a first position wherein it covers the keypad to another position wherein the cover is folded around a back portion of the communication device and acts as a stand for propping up the communication device at an angle on a surface, and a scrolling means proximate to the keypad which is not covered when the cover is in the first position enabling a user to use the scrolling means to perform a scrolling operation viewable on the display when the cover is in the first position.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Ying, Phillips, and Wolff fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 2. Therefore, claim 2 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 9, and 11

Claims 8, 9, and 11 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ying in view of Phillips and Sirola. Claims 8, 9, and 11 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

Claims 14, 19, and 31

Claims 14, 19, and 31 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ying in view of Phillips and Shima. Claims 19 and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering moot the rejection of these claims. The rejection of claim 14 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 depends from amended independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Ying and Phillips fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 1. Shima is concerned with a display apparatus having a cover with an integrated display which covers a keyboard (see Figure 2). Shima fails to

disclose that the cover is transparent or that the cover is pivotable from a first position wherein it covers the keypad to another position wherein the cover is folded around a back portion of the communication device and acts as a stand for propping up the communication device at an angle on a surface. Shima also fails to disclose a scrolling means proximate to a keypad which is not covered when the cover is in the first position enabling a user to use the scrolling means to perform a scrolling operation viewable on the display when the cover is in the first position (see Figures 2-5).

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Ying, Phillips, and Shima fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 14. Therefore, claim 14 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 18, 2006

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(404) 849-2093